

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 – 6 remain pending in the present application. The objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action are respectfully traversed below.

The Title

As requested in the Office Action, the title was amended to read “An Electronic Camera With Compression.”

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1 – 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 over **Dunton et al.** (USP 6,151,069). It is submitted that the cited prior art does not teach or suggest all the features recited in the present claimed invention.

For instance, independent claim 1 recites “a calculator for calculating a specific compression ratio capable of compressing a *preceding* image signal, outputted from said processor and corresponding to a *preceding* screen, to a specific size” and “a compressor for compressing a *current* image signal, outputted from said processor and corresponding to a *current* screen, using the specific compression ratio.” As explained in the present specification, the use of the claimed compression ratio (calculated for a *preceding* image signal) for compressing the *current* image signal makes it possible to compress image signals down to nearly the target size in a shorter amount of time when continuously shooting a subject. The cited prior art does not teach or suggest at least this claimed feature in independent claim 1.

With regard to these features, the Office Action referred to the Abstract of **Dunton** for describing “logic circuitry to spatially scale and compress if necessary the raw image data in order to meet storage and transmission bandwidth constraints for video images.” This feature is further described at column 4, line 65 to column 5, line 30 of **Dunton**. However, such disclosures teach no more than the conventional need to compress image data, similar to the discussion set forth in the background of the invention section of the present specification.

In particular, nothing in **Dunton** specifically addresses a compression technique for a plurality of screens of image signals relying on the claimed specific compression ratio that is calculated for compressing a *preceding* one of the image signals to a specific size. Such a compression ratio is used to compress a *current* one of the image signals. Nothing in **Dunton** addresses the present claimed optimal compression ratio. Nothing in **Dunton** addresses the compression ratio calculated for compressing a *preceding* image signal. Nothing in **Dunton** teaches or suggests using such a compression ratio to compress the *current* image signal. The general disclosure to compress raw image data to meet storage and transmission bandwidth requirements for video images does not at all teach or suggest the specific compression features emphasized above. For at least these reasons, the present claimed invention patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over **Dunton**, and further in view of **Mizoguchi** (USP 6,407,772). The further reference to **Mizoguchi** does not remedy the deficiencies in the primary reference to **Dunton**. The further reference to **Mizoguchi** was made

Application No.: 09/417,767

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111 dated December 2, 2003

Reply to the Office action of September 2, 2003

with respect to the further features recited in claims 5 and 6 pertaining to additional predetermined intervals. Claims 5 and 6 distinguish over the prior art for at least the reasons that their respective base claims distinguish over the prior art as discussed above.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully Submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



John P. Kong
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 40,054

JPK:kal
1250 Connecticut Avenue
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 822-1100

Q:\1999\991181\1.111 Amendment - December 2003.doc